

AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS:

Please amend the drawings as follows:

In Figure 3:

add the reference character --102--to the left of the center of the tall vertical bracket at the far left of the figure,

add the reference character --112-- identifying the "DATA TYPE(S)" column in table 106,

add the reference character --114-- identifying the "APPLICATION" column in table 106, and

add the reference character --116-- identifying the "TIME STAMP (INSTALLED)" column in table 106,

all as shown on the accompanying formal replacement Sheet 2 of the Drawings.

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the above-identified Application is respectfully requested. Claims 1-11 are in the case. Claims 1, 5 and 9 have been amended.

Prior to arguments responsive to the above-mentioned Office Action, Applicant initially points out that several inadvertent informalities were found in Figure 3 in the course of preparing this Amendment, namely, that certain reference characters referred to in the Specification were absent from the drawing. These informalities have been corrected by amendments to Figure 3. In addition, an informality in the form of an inadvertent misspelling in Claim 1, repeated in Claims 5 and 9, has been corrected by amendments thereto. The aforementioned corrections are all obvious, and no new matter has been added. Applicant respectfully requests that these amendments be entered into the case.

Regarding the rejection of Claims 1-11 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over the patent to Keohane et al. in view of the patent to Moore et al., this rejection is respectfully traversed. Representative independent Claim 1 is directed to a computer system including, *inter alia*, a first data type table that stores application and file type associations, at least one removable memory module that can be inserted into the computer system, an application program stored on the removable memory module, a second data type table stored on the removable memory module, and a system computer software routine to combine the first and second data type table to form a virtual extension table that is used to determine which application is to be used for a given file type. In this way, a removable storage medium having an application program stored thereon may be inserted into a computer system, and the computer system may keep track of data types for the application on the removable storage medium, as well as data types for other applications in the system.

The patent to Keohane et al. apparently relates to a method, performed when opening a browser, for managing files and dependent applications that act on them. In the performance of the method, a list of file types is kept, which is

read by the browser when opened. A file type is retrieved from the list, and it is then determined whether the machine (apparently, "computer") contains an application for using that file type. If so, the browser continues to the next file type in the list. If not, the browser determines if the user has already been asked about this type of file. If so, the browser continues to the next file type in the list. If not, the browser asks if the user wants to download the necessary application for that file type. If so, the necessary application is downloaded. If not, the browser continues to the next file type in the list.

Keohane et al. do not mention or suggest downloading application programs from a removable storage, as is admitted by the Examiner. Further, however, neither do they discuss or suggest providing a data type table that stores application and file type associations, much less a first and a second such tables, as required in Claim 1. Rather, Keohane et al. teach merely providing a single list of file types. Their browser refers to that list, and then determines whether their machine contains an application for that file type, by a method they do not disclose. Still further, while they do not teach or suggest that such determination is performed by providing such file type list as a column in a table, even if they had, they nowhere teach or suggest combining their list of file types with another list of file types, much less combining one table with another table.

These failures in teaching of the patent to Keohane et al. are not surprising given the difference between the purpose of their method and that of Claim 1.

The patent to Moore et al. fails to cure the deficiencies of the patent to Keohane et al. The patent to Moore et al. apparently relates to a method for automatically launching computer programs. The patent is completely silent on any table, and does not even discuss a list of file types. The patent is also completely silent on any combining or merging of even lists, much less combining or merging tables.

The other art of record is even less relevant.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that Claim 1 is neither shown nor suggested by the patent to Keohane et al., by the patent to Moore et al., nor,

indeed, by any of the art of record, whether considered individually or in any combination, and for all of the above reasons Claim 1 is patentable. Claims 5 and 9, the only other independent claims in the case, contain similar limitations to those of Claim 1 discussed above, and therefore for the same reasons these claims are patentable as well. Claims 2-4, 6-8, 10 and 11 all depend, either directly or indirectly from Claim 1, 5 or 9, and are therefore allowable as well for the same reasons, as well as for the additional limitations found therein.

Wherefore, reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection are respectfully requested.

It is respectfully submitted that the claims recite the patentably distinguishing features of the invention and that, taken together with the above remarks, the present application is now in proper form for allowance. Reconsideration of the application, as amended, and allowance of the claims are requested at an early date.

While it is believed that the instant amendment places the application in condition for allowance, should the Examiner have any further comments or suggestions, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner contact the undersigned in order to expeditiously resolve any outstanding issues.

To the extent necessary, the Applicants petition for an Extension of Time under 37 C.F.R. §1.136. Please charge any fees in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees to the Deposit Account No. 20-0668 of Texas Instruments Incorporated.

Respectfully submitted,

/J. Dennis Moore/

J. Dennis Moore
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Reg. No. 28,885

Texas Instruments Incorporated
P.O. Box 655474, MS 3999
Dallas, TX 75265
Phone: (972) 917-5646
Fax: (972) 917-4418